

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Initially, the Examiner's attention is drawn to the attached copy of the International Search Report and a Form PTO-1449 listing all references cited therein. Since the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office has already acknowledged receipt of the International Search Report and copies of such references (e.g., see the Notification of Acceptance dated 04/25/97), it is presumed that the Examiner has actually already considered these references. Accordingly, the Form PTO-1449 is attached for the Examiner's convenience in making a record of such consideration by initialing and returning a copy of this form so that all such references will appear on the face of any printed patent.

A new Abstract of the Disclosure on a separate sheet is also attached for use in lieu of the originally filed PCT Abstract. The specification and claims have been modified above so as to place them in more traditional U.S. format and are also believed to obviate the Examiner's rejection of claims 8, 12, 39 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph (alternate versions of these claims now having

B

been added as new claims 49-52, respectively, so as to maintain the desired coverage).

In particular, although the Examiner has objected to the use of the phrase "and/or" in claims 8 and 39, the position of the mobile unit may be determined by either system, or, as explained in the specification, the satellite navigation system may be supplemented by identifying the location of the mobile part with relation to the radio network as well. Thus, the new claims are intended to preserve this deserved scope of coverage.

The minor formal objections made to the drawings on Form PTO-948 have also been noted and will be corrected by suitable substitute formal drawings to be filed in response to a Notice of Allowance.

Accordingly, all outstanding formal grounds of objection/rejection are now believed to have been overcome.

The rejection of claims 1-46 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Penzias is respectfully traversed.

Penzias describes a personal transport service, apparently somewhere between a taxi service and a bus service in which a vehicle's route is selected, and

occasionally updated, in order to accommodate a number of different individuals' journeys. Part of this system includes a means for determining the current position of each vehicle, such as cellular tracking or the Global Positioning System (see column 3). There is thus means for location of the mobile unit.

The router server identifies the positions of the various vehicles, determines the points to be visited by the mobile unit according to the destinations of the passengers on board, and the locations of intending passengers who have requested rides, and transmits instructions to the individual vehicles accordingly. Essentially, the system generates a series of instructions to the driver of each vehicle, indicating a number of different locations to which he must go, in a specified order. This the Examiner reads as "means for generating guidance information according to the present location and specified destination of the mobile unit". However, there is actually no mention of providing any real guidance information (i.e., information directing the driver as to how he should proceed to get to the next designated bus stop).

That is, the "guidance" information transmitted by the routing unit includes no directions as to how to get from one pick up/set down point to the next, this appears to be left to the driver of the vehicle himself. Therefore, no guidance

B

information (as compared with a simple itinerary -- a set of way-point instructions is generated.

Penzias' mobile units also do not have specified destinations. The calling points of the mobile unit are not specified by the user of the mobile unit (who is the driver of the vehicle) but by the intending passengers. The passengers' intended destinations are specified not by the user of the mobile unit but by the user of the fixed part (who is acting in the role of a "dispatcher"). This is another distinction between Penzias and even original claim 1.

The dependent claims also specify additional features which are not suggested by Penzias. In particular, original claim 2 (now incorporated into amended claim 1) relates to a method of generating and transmitting information appropriate to a specified group of mobile units, the group being defined with respect to an area to which the information is particularly relevant. There is no suggestion of such an arrangement in Penzias. Claims 3, 4, 5 and 6 are also distinct from Penzias in at least this way.

The additional features claimed in at least claims 10, 13 and 14 are also not mentioned in the Penzias reference -- even as isolated features, let alone in the particular combinations claimed herein. Similar comments apply to independent

claim 17 as for claim 1 above. Claims 18-22 also all require the feature of claim 18 of determining the location in relation to a geographical overlay and comprising a plurality of overlay areas which is not disclosed by Penzias. At least dependent claims 25, 27 and 28 also recite novel and non-obvious additional features per se -- let alone when considered in combination with other features as claimed by Applicants.

As clearly stated in claim 30, guidance instructions between the present location and the specified location (destination) are communicated to a user by means of the guidance means. There is no suggestion in Penzias of giving guidance instructions for traveling between two locations, only of transmitting the chosen destination or destinations. Similarly, independent claim 32 also requires navigation guidance for traveling to a specified destination rather than, as in Penzias, an instruction to go to a specified destination. In other words, the fixed part, and not the mobile unit, specifies the destination to which the mobile unit is to go.

Claims 33-37 are method claims corresponding to claims 2-6 and are not disclosed by Penzias for the reasons already stated. Similarly, claims 40-42 and claims 44 and 45 also cover features not specified in Penzias.

Rejection of claims 1-46 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Behr et al. is also respectfully traversed.

Behr does appear to describe a route guidance information system of the general type envisaged by some of the original independent claims. However, it does not teach or suggest many important patentable features of the original claims. For example, the geographical overlay system (claim 2), and the process of transmitting messages to the mobile part in response to the mobile part reaching a predetermined location (e.g., claim 4) are not taught or suggested by Behr.

One particular advantage of the claim 4 arrangement is that route guidance information is only provided to the mobile unit as it is required. In Behr, the entire route information is downloaded at once. Quite apart from the amount of data that is to be downloaded, and the storage problem within a moving vehicle of such data, (or the necessity for the driver to remember it), this does not provide any facility for updating the route guidance information during the journey in response to changing traffic conditions. Other claims of particular interest, which are not taught or suggested by Behr, include claims 10, 12 and 13; and the corresponding claims dependent on claims 17 and 32 (claims 20, 25, 26, 27, 35, 41, 43, 44 and 45).

These claims include various features, notably the transmission of guidance instructions during the course of the journey (i.e., in response to a request made some time earlier) by tracking the movements of vehicles currently having requests in place which have not yet reached their destinations. In particular, claim 43 relates to the prediction of future traffic congestion, and deriving guidance data based on this predicted congestion, making use of the information about the current locations and intended destinations of the mobile parts using the system. Time information and position measurements of the mobile parts gives current data on congestion, while the guidance information previously transmitted to mobile parts can give an indication of future congestion. For example, if a large number of mobile parts are all requesting guidance to the same destination, e.g., for a football match, the system may be able to use this to predict that congestion is going to occur in the vicinity of the venue and its approach routes.

(B)

Accordingly, this entire application is now believed to be in allowable condition and a formal notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: Larry S. Nixon  
Larry S. Nixon  
Reg. No. 25,640

LSN:jls  
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201-4714  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

B